

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested since no new issues are raised and it place the application in condition for allowance or at least in better form for appeal.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Fu et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0024066). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a method of setting a communication environment between a mobile terminal and a smart card using a layered architecture of a protocol stack, which includes determining whether or not the received answer-to-reset signal complies with an answer-to-reset signal pattern required by the mobile terminal, and analyzing the answer-to-reset signal transferred from the smart card to establish a communication environment suitable for an application to be used if the received answer-to-reset signal complies with an answer-to-reset signal pattern required by the mobile terminal. The Office Action alleges that AAPA discloses the above features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In the Final Office Action, on page 6, the Examiner alleges that AAPA, on page 2, teaches that the mobile terminal 20 determines if a new communication environment between the smart card 10 and mobile terminal 20 could be established using protocol and parameter selections sent to the mobile terminal 20 by the smart card. However, AAPA does not teach such a feature. AAPA merely discloses that after receiving an answer-to-reset signal, the mobile terminal 20 sends a request signal to the smart card, in step S103, and that the smart card, in step S104, sends a response signal to the mobile terminal. In AAPA, the smart card selects the relevant protocol and parameters, not the mobile terminal. In fact, by determining whether the received answer-to-reset signal complies with an answer-to-reset signal pattern required by the mobile terminal, the mobile terminal in the present invention can avoid the requesting step S103 and the response S104 in AAPA and directly open the logical channel, as seen in Figure 3 and recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Fu does not remedy at least this deficiency of AAPA since Fu does not teach or suggest at least the above described feature of claim 1. Accordingly, no combination of AAPA and Fu teach or suggest, analyzing the answer-to-reset signal transferred from the smart card to establish a communication environment suitable for an

application to be used if the received answer-to-reset signal complies with an answer-to-reset signal pattern required by the mobile terminal, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 7 is believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above since claim 7 also recites the features of claim 1 discussed above.

Claims 2-6 and 8-12 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 7 by virtue of their dependence upon claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.


Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: 
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/VVK

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: October 7, 2005